

REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, Claims 5, 6 and 7 have been canceled, and Claim 1 has been amended. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to the drawings as not showing all of the features specified in the claims. The “one video camera providing a field of view forward and downward from the aircraft's centerline” recited in Claim 1 is shown in Figs. 1b, 2, 3 and 4. The “at least one video camera generating a digital video signal providing a plurality of video images” recited in Claim 1 is depicted in Fig. 4 as camera 14. The “video camera having a 140° field of view lens that can be rotated 90° about a mounting axis that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft, providing a maximum angular size of the video frame that is approximately 140° horizontally and 128° vertically, and which is 90° from the normal aspect ratio orientation of the lens” recited in Claim 3 is depicted in Fig. 4 as camera 14. The “plurality of video cameras” recited in Claim 4 is depicted in Fig. 1b. Regarding the remainder of the features objected to, Claims 5, 6 and 7 have now been canceled. Additional support for the recitation of the features of the “one video camera providing a field of view forward and downward from the aircraft's centerline” recited in Claim 1, and the “plurality of video cameras” recited in Claim 4 can be found in U.S. Patent No. 5,440,337, which corresponds to the subject matter of Henderson et al. cited by the Examiner, and which was incorporated by reference at page 1, line 16 of the specification, and if necessary additional figures

Serial No. 09/013,645

showing these features can be added to the present application based upon the disclosure of U.S. Patent No. 5,440,337.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 were rejected as obvious from Henderson et al. in view of Baker et al. Henderson et al. was cited as disclosing the closed circuit television system for an aircraft, comprising at least one video camera providing a field of view forward and downward from the aircraft's centerline, but not the other features of Claim 1. Baker et al. was cited as showing a manipulation apparatus, including a plurality of video display modules and a video camera control module. The Examiner further conjectured that it is considered obvious to modify the CCTV system of Henderson et al. to include the features as taught in Baker et al. "so that a CCTV for an in-flight entertainment system can provide passengers with a capability, from his or her video frame to individually select and /or control a desired field of view from an available multiple fields of view provided by either a single video camera or multiple video cameras." Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a plurality of personal control units, each of said plurality of personal control units corresponding to respective ones of said plurality of video display modules and connected to said video camera control module for operating the video camera control module to independently select a desired field of view for each of said video display modules." Support for this amendment can be found in Fig. 4 and at page 5 line 30 to page 6 line 16, which describes, for example, that "Each passenger seat video and audio display unit preferably includes a video monitor 16 and a personal control unit (PCU) 18 for operating the interactive camera system video /audio dedicated video on display system. The interactive landscape camera system enables a passenger with in-seat


Serial No. 09/013,645

audio/video on demand capability to electronically pan, tilt, and zoom the field of view of the landscape camera system camera independently of other passengers.” It is respectfully submitted that Henderson et al. and Baker et al. do not disclose, teach or suggest, or teach any motivation for providing such a plurality of personal control units for operating the video camera control module and to independently select a desired field of view for each of the video display modules. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s conclusion that to do so would be obvious is based solely upon hindsight reconstruction of the invention based upon the disclosure of the present application. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 4 on the grounds of obviousness should be withdrawn. Further, since Claim 3 depends from Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claim 3 on the grounds of obviousness should also be withdrawn.

A notice of objections to the drawings noting informalities to be corrected accompanied the Office Action, and Applicant proposes to submit formal drawings correcting the noted informalities as soon as an indication of allowance is received.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application should now be in a condition for allowance, and an early favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP

  
James W. Paul  
Registration No. 29,967

JWP/atc  
Encls.: Return Postcard  
10877 Wilshire Blvd., Tenth Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90024  
Tele. No. (310) 824-5555  
Facsimile No. (310) 824-9696